International application No.

PCT/US07/81260

A. CLAS	SSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER G06F 19/00( 2006.01);G06G 7/58( 2006.01)		
USPC: According to	702/19,27,703/11 International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both nat	tional classification and IPC	
p. Fire	De er andiren		
	DS SEARCHED		
	cumentation searched (classification system followed b 02/19,27; 703/11	y classification symbols)	
Documentation	on searched other than minimum documentation to the	extent that such documents are included in	the fields searched
	ta base consulted during the international search (name mal (EAST); RSCB Protein Databank; DialogOne (Bio		h terms used)
C. DOC	UMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		
Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where a	ppropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
x	McKluskey et al. The Inhibition of Protein Phosphate Rational Anti-Cancer Drug Design? Anti-Cancer Dru See p. 298, 1st column, Docking Studies; also see p.	ig Design, 2001, Vol. 16, pp. 291-303.	1-17
· x	Sakoff & McCluskey, Protein Phosphatase Inhibition: Structure Based Design. Townsth New Therapeutic Agents. Current Pharmacoutical Design, 2004, Vol. 10, pp. 1139-1159. See entite article, specifically, p. 1143, Table 1; Sections 3.1.1-3.1.6 and Section 3.3, specifically 3.3.6. Cho & Xu, Crystal Structure of a Protein Phosphatase 2A Heterotrimeric Holoenzyme, Nature, E-publication: OI November 2006, Vol. 445, pp. 33-57. See entire stricle.		1-17
т			1-17
`т	Xu et al. Structure of the Protein Phosphatase 2A Ho pp. 1239-1251. See entire article.	1-17	
			-8-
Further	documents are listed in the continuation of Box C.	See patent family annex.	
Special categories of cited documents:  "A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance.		T later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention	
"E" curtier app	plication or patent published on or after the international filing date	"X" document of particular relevance, the claimed invention cannot be- considered nevel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step- when the document is taken alone  "Y" document of particular relevance, the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or infer colder and becomes, such combination	
	t which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as		
	t referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means	being obvious to a person skilled in the	ert
	t published prior to the international filing date but later than the ate claimed	"&" document member of the same patent is	amily
Date of the ac	ctual completion of the international search	Date of mailing of the international searc	h report
12 August 2008 (12.08.2008)		II SEP ZUUO	
	alling address of the ISA/US	Authorized officer	
Commissioner for Patents		SUZANNE M. NOAKES	
P.O Ale	. Box 1450 xandria, Virginia 22313-1450	Telephone No. 571-272-1600	
Facsimile No.	. (571) 273-3201		
Orm PCT/ISA	/210 (second sheet) (April 2007)		

International application No. PCT/US07/81260

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim N
Α.	Groves et al. The Structure of the Protein Phosphatse 2A PR65/A Subunit Reveals the Conformation of Its 15 Tandemly Repeated HEAT Motifs. Cell, 1999, Vol. 96, pp.99-110. See entire stricte.	1-17
<b>A</b>	Boudreas et al. The use of okadaic acid to elucidate the intracellular role(s) of protein phosphatase ZA: Lessons from the mast cell model system. International Immunopharmacology, September 2005, Vol. 5, No. 10, pp. 1507-1518. See entire article.	1-17
i		
	,	
	in .	
	*	

International application No.

PCT/US07/81260

Box No. II Observations where certain claims were found unsearchable (Continuation of item 2 of first sheet) This international search report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2)(a) for the following reasons: because they relate to subject matter not required to be searched by this Authority, namely: Claims Nos.: because they relate to parts of the international application that do not comply with the prescribed requirements to such an extent that no meaningful international search can be carried out, specifically: Claims Nos . because they are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of Rule 6.4(a). Box No. III Observations where unity of invention is lacking (Continuation of item 3 of first sheet) This International Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application, as follows: Please See Continuation Sheet As all required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers all searchable claims As all searchable claims could be searched without effort justifying additional fees, this Authority did not invite payment of any additional fees. As only some of the required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers only those claims for which fees were paid, specifically claims Nos.: No required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this international search report is restricted to the invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claims Nos.: 1-17 Remark on Protest The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest and, where applicable, the payment of a protest fee. The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid within the time limit specified in the invitation. No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.

Form PCT/ISA/210 (continuation of first sheet(2)) (April 2007)

International application No. PCT/I ISO7/81260

## BOX III. OBSERVATIONS WHERE UNITY OF INVENTION IS LACKING

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In order for all inventions to be examined, the appropriate additional examination fees must be paid.

Group I, claim(s) 1-17, drawn to protein phosphatase 2A (PP2A) binding compounds which have a three-dimensional structure corresponding to an atomic model of PP2A that has okadaic acid or microsystin-LR bound thereto.

Group II, claim(s) 18-25, drawn to a method of preparing a protein phosphatase 2A core binding compound by performing in silico rationale drug design methods and synthesizing the identified compounds.

Group III. claim(s) 26-28, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising an effective amount of a compound.

Group IV, claim(s) 29-34, drawn to a method of identifying a carcinogen by determining the atomic coordinates of a compound and applying three-dimensional molecular modeling algorithms to the compound and PP2A to electronically screen the compounds.

The inventional insted as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 3.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following resons: Rolles 12 at 1,6 Anti-Cancer Drug Beign, 2001, 16:291-303) teach a method of identifying a new class of protein phosphatase 2A sinhibitor compounds by suitonally designess sinal compounds by using the tree-dimensional atomic coordinates of a modeled PP24 structure. The method utilizes the three-dimensional molecular modeling algorithm/program Ceruic2-LigandFit (see p. 298, 1° column, Docking Studies; also seep. 294, 1st column, 1st two, paragraphs) to societain the exact hinding mode of readdate compounds number 24 and 25, which are synthesized compounds. Thus, both the compounds and the method minimally suicipate claims I and 18. It is noted that the former is anticipated as the compound is a product-by-process omnous of wherein said process does not necessarily impair novely to said occupants.

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of Groups I-IV does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, it does not differentiate the claimed subject matter as a whole over the prior art. Since according to PCT Rule 13.2 the presence of such a common or corresponding special technical feature is an absolute prerequisite for unity to be established, and given that there does not appear to be any other technical feature common to the claimed subject matter as a whole which might be able to fulfill this role, the currently claimed subject matter (as a winty of inventions according to PCT Rule 13.1.